

A1336

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 12

Trim "Needs" to Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, public interest in the size of the proposed deficit continues to mount. It becomes very readily apparent that the answer to the debate is a conscientious effort on the part of the Congress to trim the budget.

This point is well emphasized in an editorial of the Tuesday, March 5 issue of the Chicago Tribune, which I ask leave to insert into the Record at this point.

TRIM "NEEDS" TO MEANS

If you don't have shoes you obviously need a pair. If you have one pair you need another, because two pairs worn alternately wear longer than two consecutive pairs. If you have two pairs, you need another, for different purposes, still better wear, and the feeling of well-being that will promote your fortune. This goes for any number up to 20 pairs.

A process like this accounts for the size of the budget of the United States. Ambitious politicians find "need" to fill, and votes to reap. If a "need" has widespread appeal, such as handouts to distressed areas, it gets corresponding support. If it pleases only a small group, such as a research grant to improve the breed of silkworms, logrolling is required; legislators pass each other's vote bait.

The Washington staff of the Knight newspapers made a comparative page-by-page study of the budget—the size of a mail-order catalog—for the third time in 7 years. Their report left no doubt of the empire-building motives behind the mushrooming of bureaus and projects.

As Edwin A. Lahey expressed it, "a hundred thousand rolls into a million, a million rolls into a billion, and a billion into \$99 billion." Somebody gets the idea that it would be good to promote civilian interest in marksmanship, and a cash subsidy is voted to buy ammunition. In 1964 this item will be \$1,600,000. This, of course, is one of the smallest items, but it illustrates the psychological basis for many of the projects: "As long as we are wasting billions elsewhere, we can surely spare a few millions for this worthy program."

The budget abounds with startling contradictions. Subsidies to support the price of farm crops produced in excess of demand will cost \$4.4 billion, while other large sums will be spent to find ways to raise farm output.

It may be granted that some benefit flows from every one of these projects. Somebody gets the money. But here we go back to the "need" for more shoes. There would surely be some advantage in having them. But lacking the price, only a nitwit would conclude that the advantages of 2 dozen shoes were greater than the disadvantages of debt incurred to buy them.

There is a strange and often-disproved theory that, by spending for all these purposes \$12 billion more than the \$87 billion the Government will take in, some magic takes place that transforms debt into prosperity. What actually happens is that the deficit is paid by cheapening the money.

This process is familiar to any man who, 20 years ago, bought insurance designed to give his widow \$200 or so a month. He paid hard dollars, but the dollars his widow gets won't go very far.

If everyone able to see the connection between profligate spending and the rising cost of living were to complain to his Congressman, the budget would be cut substantially. Necessary expenditures for defense and other purposes are great enough, without stripping the taxpayers to spend for spending's sake.

The politicians, of course, think the most votes are to be had by the course followed in the present budget. It has yet to be proved that they are wrong.

Rev. Peter S. Rush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Peter S. Rush, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Jersey City, N.J., who entered upon a brilliant military career when he accepted appointment as a chaplain in the New Jersey National Guard in 1940, was recently appointed a brigadier general, New Jersey Army National Guard. On that occasion he was honored by a military review which was attended by a large group of his friends.

Following service in World War II, Chaplain Rush remained on active duty and saw further service with combat forces in Korea.

The report of the review tendered Chaplain Rush as it appeared in the Jersey Journal follows:

HUDSON "LITTLE CHAPLAIN" NOW BRIGADIER GENERAL

A man who had been "just a little chaplain in the Army" during World War II, yesterday became the first brigadier general in the Chaplain Corps of the New Jersey Army National Guard.

The Reverend Peter S. Rush, pastor of St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, received his commission as a general following a review of troops held in his honor at the Jersey City Armory, headquarters of the 2d Brigade, 50th Armored Division, New Jersey Army National Guard. Participating in the review at 3 p.m. were the men of the 1st Battalion, 113th Infantry, the 2d Battalion, 112th Infantry, and the 50th Armored Division Band.

Some 1,500 spectators watched the colorful ceremonies and applauded the smart-looking and well-drilled troops. Among the guests of honor were Bishop Martin Stanton, the Sisters of Joseph's Convent, many State and city officials and Irish Constable Patrick J. Kenny.

Top brass in the reviewing party included Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff of the New Jersey Department of Defense, who presented the commission in behalf of Gov. Richard J. Hughes; Lt. Col. Philipp W. Kunz, local commander, and Lt. Col. Alfred A. De Matteo.

Also among the spectators was St. Joseph's Girl Scout Troops 29 and 36, led by Dorothy and Mary Holt of 71 Warner Avenue.

Father Rush, wearer of the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Army Commendation Medal with oak leaf clusters, served with distinction in the 44th Division, 71st Division and on the staffs of Gen. Mark Clark and Gen. Lucius Clay in World War II. He also served in Korea, taking part in eight major campaigns.

Part 13: Let's Keep the Record Straight— A Selected Chronology of Castro and Cuba—January 14, 1963 to January 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today's continuation of my chronology on Castro and Cuba involves a rehash of Fidel Castro's five point program—which he had announced on October 23, 1962, as being the only basis on which the Cuban and U.S. crisis could be solved.

These five points were:

First. End of economic blockade and all measures of commercial and economic pressure exercised against Cuba by the United States.

Second. End of all subversive activities, dropping and landing of arms and explosives by air and sea, organization of mercenary invasions, infiltration of spies and saboteurs, "all of which actions are organized in the territory of the United States and certain accomplice countries."

Third. End of pirate attacks carried out from bases in the United States and Puerto Rico.

Fourth. End of all violations of air and naval space by U.S. planes and ships.

Fifth. U.S. withdrawal from the naval base of Guantanamo and return of this territory to Cuba.

That these five points had suddenly assumed importance to not only Castro but also to the U.S.S.R. and Red China was proved by their quick expression of support for the statements—which they ignored at the time the crisis was at fever pitch.

Castro, emboldened now by Kremlin support for his five points—publicly called for all Latin American revolutionaries to rise up against imperialism while denouncing the United States as "the most aggressive nation in the world."

His words stating that "a war was avoided, but the peace was not won," were strikingly similar to many uttered by American citizens, including those in the political field—proving that at least there was agreement between Castro and the United States on one issue.

The only ones who appeared completely happy and satisfied with the arrangements were the Soviets—because as Khrushchev so obligingly had pointed out—the Communist regime was firmly fixed on the island of Cuba—and in exchange for only 40 or so missiles, a few planes, a few Soviet troops.

Castro designated our Alliance for Progress foreign aid program for Latin America as reactionary and antiquated—declaring it would not "prosper because it is a policy of exploitation." This was a clear indication of the Communist line to be preached in South America regarding our efforts to aid them—but many North Americans—while agreeing on the term "exploitation"—felt they were the

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I commend the article to every Member of the House and to every Senator as a prime example of the faith we all should have in the future of America and of our democratic way of life against the onslaught of communism or any other tyrannical form of government. These two corpsmen are splendid examples of the determination and the strength of young Americans to preserve democracy in these United States and to spread its light around the world. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article from the U.S. News & World Report into the RECORD.

The article follows:

CLOSEUP OF THE CORPS — 1 YEAR LATER

ZIPACON, Colombia.—Drive along the dusty, mountain road to this village of 3,800 people and you get an idea of what the Peace Corps has meant to one community bypassed by progress for many years.

Since late in 1961, two young Americans have been working here as part of the first contingent of Peace Corps volunteers sent to underdeveloped countries.

Zipacon, nestled in a green valley 8,700 feet high in the Andes, is only an hour's drive from Colombia's modern capital of Bogotá. But in terms of living conditions, it is ages distant.

The people of Zipacon have no running water or sewage facilities. Only a few houses have electricity. Death from dysentery, tuberculosis or malnutrition is a constant threat.

Shortly after the Peace Corps men moved in, one of them, Dennis Grubb, 21, of Westport, Conn., told a visiting staff member of U.S. News & World Report:

"I don't know how all this is going to turn out, but we sure are going to give it a big try. Frankly, I think we've got something good going here."

EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS

That "something" Mr. Grubb spoke of is now clearly visible to the returning visitor.

Entering Zipacon, you see a cooperative food store, opened just recently. Farther down the road is the site of a low-cost housing development. On the other side of town is a new, one-room schoolhouse of brick.

Freshly cut roads wind out in three directions to outlying parts of the village. Along one of these, the foundation is being laid for a small electric power plant. And, in the center of town, an old building is being converted into a community recreation center.

These projects—and a dozen others in the works—probably constitute the biggest burst of civic improvement that Zipacon has experienced in its 400 years of recorded history.

HELPING ONESELF

This is no crash program of U.S. aid. None of the projects has been financed by the Alliance for Progress, the program of economic assistance to Latin American countries. The changes in Zipacon spring from what is essentially a self-help operation.

Several organizations, public and private, are playing parts. So are dozens of villagers, working in their spare time without pay. But the spark and drive for these changes stem, in large part, from Mr. Grubb and his teammate, presently Carl Stephens, of Lexington, Ky. Theirs hasn't always been an easy task.

Most of the adults of Zipacon are farm-workers who earn about 50 cents a day laboring in nearby fields. Until recently, they were accustomed to expect all benefits to

flow from the top down—from the central government, the big landowners or the church.

Like their forefathers, they waited for improvements to come from these traditional sources rather than organizing to get things done themselves. Down through the years, as a result, improvements came slowly in Zipacon—when at all.

At the start, many villagers saw the Peace Corps as a sort of philanthropic agency from which new benefits—including lots of cash—would flow. Some still think that way, despite contrary evidence. Others have answered calls for volunteers on various projects, have worked or watched a while, then drifted away. Still others have refused to cooperate.

MOMENT OF CRISIS

At one point, last December, it even looked as if the Peace Corps might have to pull out of Zipacon by public demand.

Trouble broke out when a newspaper in Bogotá printed an overly vivid account of the difficulties facing the two Americans in the rural community. A few irate citizens, claiming that the article pictured their village in a bad light, organized a strong protest that singled out the Peace Corps for blame.

Dennis Grubb and his partner left town for a 2-week Christmas vacation, not knowing whether they would be able to resume work here. But several of their new friends got busy and rallied the villagers to their support. The Peace Corps men were welcomed back with a community celebration in their honor.

One measure of how far the civic do-it-yourself movement has gone since then is the number of villagers who show up each weekday morning for voluntary work details. In recent months, the turnout has numbered almost 80 percent of the farm-workers in the district, working on their off days.

STORY OF A SCHOOL

The story of the building of the Santa Ana school shows how the Peace Corps works hand-in-hand with the local residents to push through improvements.

People in the Rincón Santo district had been trying to get a school for some time before the Peace Corps moved in. They had an acre of land available, but no money to pay for construction. That left 40 children in the district without classroom or teacher.

The Peace Corps men found the villagers willing to build the school themselves if they could get the materials. It was decided to put up a temporary structure that would qualify the district to get a teacher assigned by the state government.

The Peace Corps brought in a simple, hand-operated machine for making building blocks. The machine was provided by CARE, the international welfare agency. Soon, the villagers were turning out blocks made of local materials. Volunteer workers got donations of other necessary building materials. The school was finished in 1 month, and a teacher arrived a few weeks later to start the first classes.

NEEDED A ROAD

Next, Corpsman Grubb and a village leader approached a business firm in Bogotá that had established a plan to devote part of its profits to the construction of permanent rural schools. To be eligible for such aid the village had to provide a road to the school site.

The Americans checked around and got the loan of a bulldozer from a Colombian Government agency. The community agreed to pay for fuel for the bulldozer and to put in culverts and fencing along the new road. Money for this was raised by holding a bazaar.

Both men and women chipped in to help build the road. Mr. Grubb and his partner did the surveying and helped operate the bulldozer. They pitched in and shoveled dirt when necessary.

When the road was finished, the company in Bogotá donated \$2,500 for the new school. In 9 weeks, with almost every able-bodied citizen of the district taking part, the red brick building was completed.

Out of that project, the Peace Corps got more than a school built. It got the first civic-action committee in the area that is now entirely on its own. The Peace Corps is no longer needed to spur action or round up work details. And that was one of its major goals.

"It's the future we are concerned about," says Mr. Grubb. "That one school is nothing to what these people can do for themselves in years to come with confidence and community spirit."

THE NEXT TARGET

For the immediate future, the Peace Corps has various projects in the works in Zipacon. One is the expansion of a tiny health center, which now has few drugs and limited medical equipment. Another is the building of a second school. Also active are plans for more roads to link the village with nearby communities and make it a market center.

In the meantime, the two Americans keep busy on a variety of other chores. Recently, they plastered the town with announcements of a free chest X-ray and vaccination program, provided by a Government medical team. The two also showed a movie that emphasized the importance of protection against smallpox. There was a record turnout when the doctors arrived in Zipacon.

The people of Zipacon long since have accepted the Peace Corps men as fellow members of the community. Children hail them in the streets. They are star players on the basketball team of the local athletic club. When the governor of the department of Cundinamarca appeared at a festival in Zipacon recently, village leaders asked Mr. Grubb to make the welcoming speech.

FOR REDS: A QUESTION

Even the Communists in Bogotá have been taking notice of the Peace Corps work in Zipacon and other villages. Not long ago, two Communists appeared at a village function and tried to stir up a protest against the United States.

"Let's talk about you Communists," said Mr. Grubb. "Just what have you done to help the people of Zipacon?" The Reds had no answer.

For the U.S. taxpayer, the cost of helping Zipacon to develop itself has been small. The two Americans each get Colombian money equivalent to about \$122 a month. Another \$75 a month is credited to their accounts back in the United States toward the day when they leave the Peace Corps. In their first year they received about \$150 more for housing, furniture, and work clothing.

In addition, CARE provided supplies worth \$1,400—a mimeograph machine for public notices, medical and sports kits for schools, surveying equipment, books, and a horse. The Peace Corps team in Zipacon has no motor vehicle.

In looking back on his first 12 months in Zipacon, Mr. Grubb is cautious about making any claims. He feels a sense of accomplishment at having been able to adjust to different customs, different living conditions, and a different language. But he feels, too, that the job he started in Zipacon—helping other people to help themselves—has barely begun.

"There's a lot more work to be done here," he says. "You can't hope to succeed in this type of work in 1 year—maybe not even in 5 years. But I believe we have made a start in the right direction."

A1340

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 12

likely to tiptoe gently into a troubled situation, using patience and forbearance. It is, on the contrary, likely to get tough at a fairly early stage.

The U.N. is, moreover, building standby power to be tough.

Master files are being built up to show the kinds of skills and specialties available. If the U.N. were to need an airport management crew, for example, one could probably be found, and delivered on a few days' notice.

The prospect of a U.N. with "teeth"—with power to impose the will of the world community on trouble-makers—is better now than at any time since 1946 and 1947, when the charter dream of a world peace army originally faded.

Cost of Government Purchases To Go Down in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, though Raleigh, N.C., is not a part of my district, my study into Government procurement has led to my interest in an industry there. Due to a decision by the Comptroller General on a case I submitted last November, that industry is about to get a Government contract and save \$10,000 for the taxpayers.

Due to this firm's efficiency and the Comptroller General's decision to uphold its position, a radio transceiver is going to be built for the Federal Aviation Agency at a lower cost than would have been the case. If there are more decisions with this conclusion, we can expect the cost of Government purchasing to go down in the future.

Many of my colleagues are aware that for months and months I have made a detailed study of electronics purchases by the Government. In many cases the taxpayer has been the loser. In some I have been able to report successes in changed regulations and in savings to the taxpayers. The latter is true today—a happy ending for manufacturer, taxpayer, Government, and, yes, this Congressman.

Last November this firm outlined for me a problem it had with the FAA. Quoting for manufacture of a small radio transceiver, it inadvertently neglected to include a detailed description of the equipment with its proposal, as prescribed by FAA regulations. Because of this, it was ruled out of the procurement. At this very same time, this same firm was making the identical equipment for FAA under another contract, and for this reason was able to be low bidder. In other words, because of a technicality, this firm's competence was scribed by FAA regulations. Because of merit was to rise by \$10,000.

After studying the case closely, I contacted the Comptroller General and said:

While the difference between this company's bid and that of the next low bidder does not exceed \$10,000, it appears to me that any award other than to this firm would be a waste of tax dollars.

After a thorough study, the Comptroller General agreed with me and advised me by letter, March 7, 1963, that he had made a determination in favor of the Raleigh firm and it should get the contract. Despite the clerical error, the Comptroller General acted in behalf of saving the taxpayer's money. It is too bad we do not have more such people.

This is another case in a long list I am going to present in this session. I will also suggest legislative corrections, such as my H.R. 4409. As these cases are compiled, I hope the Rules Committee will take heed and report H.R. 4409 to the floor for action by the House. Its enactment into law, plus enactment of other legislation I shall soon propose, would curtail many abuses now being carried out in the name of national defense and would result in tremendous savings to the taxpayer.

Foreign Aid: Lack of Popular Support Is a Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the very perceptive columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond of the New York Herald Tribune news service, effectively set straight the record on public support of our foreign aid program. Noting that 58 percent of the American people approve foreign aid, Mr. Drummond suggests that the Congress would be well advised if it were to be guided in this crucial matter by the judgment expressed by the great majority of our citizens.

That foreign aid does not enjoy the support of the majority of the American people is, as Mr. Drummond points out, a myth. The time has come to explode that myth and consider foreign aid on the basis of what it has accomplished and will continue to accomplish in the fight to improve conditions in impoverished areas, to strengthen economies of depressed nations and to bolster democratic governments throughout the world.

Mr. Drummond's column on this important subject which appeared in the March 12 issue of the Washington Post follows:

FOREIGN AID—LACK OF POPULAR SUPPORT IS A MYTH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When Congress comes to vote on the foreign aid program, it ought to vote on the basis of fact, not on the basis of fiction.

The greatest fiction of all, to which President Kennedy has unintentionally made his own contribution, is that most American people are against it.

The opposite is the truth.

In his year-end TV interview the President, thinking that he was speaking with ingratiating candor, cited the foreign aid program as crucial despite the "fact" that it is a large burden not popularly supported.

This is not the fact.

The truth is that the foreign aid program is a relatively small burden (one-twentieth of the budget) and is popularly approved.

Here is the evidence.

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South, 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

Public backing of foreign aid is 7 percent higher than it was in 1958, 2 percent higher than in 1955.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about \$4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Most of those who question foreign aid think that the appropriation is much higher than it is.

This, I think, gives a far different picture of American public opinion than the widespread myth that foreign aid is unpopular, even resented, by the great majority of the people.

The nearest thing to a national referendum is this 9-year sequence of Gallup polls. It shows that Mr. Kennedy has been making a mistake by talking about the unpopularity of the program. He should be talking about its popularity.

An examination of the exhaustive backup statistics and individual responses which lie behind the public reports of the Gallup findings justify these factual conclusions:

The principle of foreign aid is more strongly supported today than in 1958, and at least as strongly as any time since 1955.

The percentage of people opposed to the principle of foreign aid has shown a drop of 3 percentage points since 1958; the number of people with no opinion has dropped 4 percent. This suggests that the principle of foreign aid continues to draw supporters rather than opponents.

Public support for foreign aid is highest among those who know more of the facts about the program. More than 40 percent of the people polled think the foreign aid appropriations represent 10 percent of the national budget instead of 5 percent. More than 80 percent did not know the approximate amount appropriated.

The humanitarian aspects of foreign aid have the greatest appeal to the American people. More than 65 percent of the pro-foreign aid comments of those polled gave the humanitarian reason as the basis of their support.

On the other hand more than 40 percent of those who were critical of the program were not opposed in principle—just felt it was not well administered.

Congress certainly ought to take a hard look on a country-by-country basis to determine for itself how well the program is being administered, and wherein foreign aid is being well or where badly utilized. I am not defending any particular level of appropriation. I am simply reporting that in approving the continuance of foreign aid, Congress would be reflecting the judgment of the great majority of the American people.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1339

January 23, 1963: Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, proposed a full Senate Armed Services Committee investigation of the disastrous 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, the committee chairman, said if military and defense issues and not politics are involved the committee would look into them.

"It's not our function to settle political matters," he said.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, whose Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs has already investigated the invasion, told the Senate its members should read the still-secret transcript of those hearings before making partisan speeches.

GOLDWATER fired back that he had and "it's the most inconclusive testimony I've ever read."

GOLDWATER proposed that the Armed Services Committee have \$100,000 to finance its inquiry and report no later than March 31. GOLDWATER is a committee member.

The Senator said the then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, and Allen Dulles, then Central Intelligence Agency chief, should be called to testify.

January 23, 1963: Former President Eisenhower said the ill-fated plan to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs was not conceived during his administration, but that, instead, a guerrilla type of action was contemplated.

General Eisenhower discussed the Cuban situation and numerous other domestic and international topics during a taped interview with newsmen Walter Cronkite on CBS (WTOP-TV in Washington).

When Cronkite asked the former Chief Executive whether the Cuban invasion plan had been made under his administration, General Eisenhower replied: "No, No, No."

He added: "There was no way. We didn't even know at that time whether we could do anything more, or whether these refugees would be sufficiently numerous and strong to do more than go into the eastern part of the island, in the mountains, and start in the return a counterrevolution."

He said the planning was to find a leader for the Cuban people to help them to rise up and overthrow Cuban Premier Fidel Castro but, "how are you going to find a man that was not a Batista man, and not a Castro man, and still be a leader?"

South Bend Tribune and Washington Daily News Approve U.S. Position on Financing of Peacekeeping Operations of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD two excellent editorials endorsing the recent decision of the U.S. Government with respect to U.S. contributions to the financing of the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

The first editorial, "Holding Feet to the Fire," was published in the March 10, 1963, issue of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune:

HOLDING FEET TO THE FIRE

In an article on this page today, William R. Frye poses the question: Can the United Nations take on another peacekeeping operation like the Congo?

He reports the answer of the people at the U.N. to be: "Yes, providing the money problem can be solved. Nothing will be possible unless the U.N. can learn to pay its bills."

There is increasing evidence that the U.N. will have to solve its money problem without extraordinary help from the United States. And it should. The United States too long has been expected to take up the slack every time the world organization runs into financial difficulties.

The latest evidence that the United States is tiring of the "sugar daddy" role came last week in a singularly stern message to the U.N. Finance Committee.

In the future, the committee was informed, the United States will pay no more than its regular 32-percent assessment for U.N. operations, including those in the peacekeeping category.

There would be an exception, the committee was told, if delinquent members pay up approximately \$130 million in arrearages.

The statement said: "The U.S. position on any possible future contributions above our regular scale assessment for peacekeeping operations will be decisively influenced in the months ahead by the financial support which other members of the United Nations actually provide."

The pressure which the United States is exerting on the U.N. to put its financial house in order is appropriate.

It reflects, we think, the sentiments of a growing number of Americans who respect the United Nations and all it stands for, but are convinced that for its own good and effectiveness it must learn to stand on its own feet.

U.S. public opinion and congressional support of the U.N. will be weakened dangerously if the responsible leadership at the United Nations ignores the warning to cease looking to Washington for more than a fair share of financial support from this country.

Mr. Speaker, the second, entitled "Good News," is from the March 12, 1963, issue of the Washington Daily News:

Good News

The United States properly, and at long last, is snapping shut its pocketbook at the United Nations. Or so our Government says.

From here on, U.S. Ambassador Francis T. Filmon has told the U.N.'s 21-nation Finance Committee, the United States will pay no more than its regular share for underwriting the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations. (We have paid 49 percent of the U.N. Congo costs, for example, although our official assessment is only 32.02 percent of the U.N. budget.)

Only exception would be if other nations now in arrears paid up their debts and then on some future need agreed to contribute more than their regular assessments.

Touche and bravo. Let's make this one foreign policy we stick to.

Under unanimous consent I also insert the article by William R. Frye published in the South Bend Tribune to which the editorial in that newspaper makes reference:

U.N.'s "TEETH" ARE GROWING FAST—SO IS WILLINGNESS TO USE THEM

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—United Nations experience in the Congo—and the possibility of new crises in Borneo or Yemen—have raised a question: Can the U.N. take on another major peacekeeping operation like the Congo?

The answer U.N. people give is: "Yes, provided the money problem can be solved." Nothing will be possible unless the U.N. can learn to pay its bills.

Other hurdles, however, have been overcome in a way which no one would have dreamed possible 2 years ago. The U.N. has been growing "teeth" at a fantastic rate.

Some of the problems solved, or well on the way to solution, are these:

1. A command structure: 2 years ago, the U.N. scarcely realized it might need a commander in chief and a chain of command. Its biggest operation up to that point had been little more than an armed observer corps.

In the Congo, the U.N. had to fight.

There is at U.N. headquarters what amounts to a military chief of staff under Secretary General U Thant. He is Brig. I. J. Rikhye, an Indian general officer. He has three lieutenant colonels and a Canadian air force squadron leader under him.

They ran the military side of the Congo war. Their desks are practically side by side on the 38th floor of the U.N. Building with those of Dr. Ralph J. Bunche and his three deputies, who controlled the political side of the operation.

The two offices—political and military—worked together.

2. Equipment and firepower: The United Nations idea of how to equip an army in the field has been transformed in the past 2 years.

Former Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, for example, never dreamed that the Congo force would need fighter aircraft.

The U.N. did not expect to have to fight. Self-defense, the governing principle of the force, was taken to mean passive defense—shooting back if one were shot at. Actively wiping out an enemy's strong points in order to prevent an attack was not remotely considered.

The fighting with Katanga in September 1961 changed all that. Suddenly, in order to protect its personnel, the U.N. had to have insignificant fire power, air cover, and combat logistics. With American help, it got it.

3. Training: U.N. people say it takes a good 6 months to break in a colonel or a general who is assigned to work for the United Nations. During that period, he is often the U.N.'s toughest problem.

U.N. civilians, too, have a lot to learn about working with an army. Executives from headquarters with little or no military background sometimes found themselves sent to the Congo on 48 hours' notice and put in what amounted to tactical command of an army of several thousand men.

Both civilians and military men need training in U.N.-type military operations. Rikhye has worked out a plan for a 3-month training course at a kind of command and general staff college to be set up in Geneva. But it has been shelved for budget reasons. It would cost \$50,000 to \$60,000 for each course.

4. Legal and constitutional inhibitions: Hammarskjöld always interpreted the U.N. charter to mean the U.N. could not properly impose peaceful settlements. He painstakingly negotiated Egypt's consent, for example, before sending the U.N.'s Mideast peace force into Gaza in 1957.

Later, this force was authorized to shoot at illegal border-crossers only under extreme circumstances. It had to be called self-defense. Still later, in 1958, the U.N. observer team in Lebanon telephoned infiltrators and made appointments to come and inspect their illegal activities.

In the Congo, the U.N. had to impose peace. There was no practical alternative. It tried persuasion, and got nowhere. It cracked down.

This was a much more important psychological and political watershed than many realize. In the future, the U.N. is much less

March 12

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1338

January 15, 1963: Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev called for a truce today in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

His call for a halt in the increasingly bitter and vocal dispute between Moscow and Peking over the Soviet Union's peaceful coexistence policy caught the free world and probably also the Communist world off balance.

In defending his principle of coexistence, Khrushchev said that in the past it had given the Communists time to build strength and was essential for future victories.

This, he claimed, was the basis of his Cuban tactics. While admitting that some critics had called removal of the rockets from Cuba "defeat," he claimed he had only been "flexible," and that President Kennedy suffered ultimate defeat because Cuba remained a Communist nation.

January 16, 1963: With Poland's Wladyslaw Gomulka setting the stage, Communist Parties of the Western world started jumping aboard Nikita S. Khrushchev's Sino-Soviet truce bandwagon today.

In a 25-minute speech to the East German Communist Party's Sixth Congress, Gomulka said that dirty linen should not be washed in public but should be cleaned patiently and quietly in "internal discussions."

"The public polemics which are damaging the cause of international unity of the Communist movement and the irresponsible attacks on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the leaders of some Communist Parties increased during the crisis in the Caribbean (Cuba)."

"The leadership of these parties did not want to understand that the crisis was solved favorably for Cuba and the cause of world socialism, through the policy pursued by the Soviet Union."

January 16, 1963: Cuban delegate Armando Hart-Davalos made an impassioned plea at the East German Party Congress for Communist unity.

"We Cubans regard it as a vital obligation to defend Communist solidarity. With the help of serious critical analysis we should be able to prevent the present differences of opinion from reaching a crisis."

January 17, 1963: "Miami, Fla., January 18.—Ninety persons, 38 of them U.S. citizens who had been living in Cuba, arrived today aboard a Pan American airliner which had flown to Havana with a load of ransom for liberated invasion prisoners."

U.S. Immigration Service officials said the other 52 passengers were relatives of the Americans.

January 18, 1963: In a speech to the East German Communist Party Congress, chief Chinese Communist delegate Wu Hsiu-Chuan stated that all the heroic Cuban people mobilized themselves, united around their revolutionary leader, comrade Fidel Castro, persevered in the five just demands for the protection of Cuba's independence and sovereignty and waged an uncompromising struggle against U.S. imperialism, thus it was the heroic Cuban people, with the sympathy and support of the peoples of labor in America and the world, who won the great victory in defense of Cuba's independence, sovereignty and the fruits of her revolution and made a great contribution to the cause of world peace.

U.S. imperialism bullies the fainthearted but fears the stouthearted, what it fears most is the strength of a united revolutionary people.

January 18, 1963: Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev said today as many as 120 Russian missiles are ready to be launched at the United States in case of war.

"The American imperialists know that we withdrew 40 rockets from Cuba," he told East German steelworkers at Eisenhuettenstadt. "But we have set up 80, probably even 120 rockets in other places."

"Cuba is not the most convenient place to base rockets," the Communist leader said in his most anti-Western speech since he arrived for the East German Communist Party Congress last Monday. "We have better places than Cuba."

"The United States wanted to use 300,000 men against Cuba," he said. "They bared their teeth like wolves, but still did not bite. Has American imperialism lost its appetite? No, but we are a powerful club."

January 20, 1963: The Swiss announced tonight that the way had been cleared to allow between 900 and 1,000 more relatives of Cuban invasion prisoners to leave Cuba aboard the American ship *Shirley Lykes*.

An Embassy spokesman said, "The Cuban authorities have said they will make available exit permits for between 900 and 1,000 Cuban citizens directly related to the former Playa Giron (Bay of Pigs) invasion prisoners."

January 20, 1963: Citing the Cuban crisis, Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urged today that the powers of the President to handle foreign policy be strengthened.

FULBRIGHT said foreign policy powers in Congress interfere with the effectiveness of the President's leadership.

This was demonstrated clearly in the October Cuban crisis when there was no alternative to Presidential decision and action, FULBRIGHT said.

The circumstances were such that it was quite impossible to seek the counsel of the leaders of Congress, who, in fact, and quite properly, were informed but not consulted," the Senator continued.

January 20, 1963: Stewart Alsop said today that Adlai E. Stevenson advised the National Security Council to consider giving up the Guantanamo Naval Base, if necessary, in exchange for the dismantling of Russian rocket bases in Cuba.

Alsop said he and the coauthor of the report, Charles Bartlett, obtained their information during three lengthy talks with Clayton Fritchey, Stevenson's official spokesman at the United Nations.

He said Fritchey approved this summary of Stevenson's position: "Stevenson was only willing to discuss Guantanamo and the European bases with the Communists after a neutralization of the Cuban missiles."

Alsop quotes from notes made by Bartlett in an interview with Fritchey: "Stevenson's general approach was to avoid military action until the peacekeeping machinery of the U.N. had a chance to function. He therefore opposed the air attack and favored the blockade. As the consensus hardened on the quarantine approach, he turned his thoughts toward the possibility of a settlement, both short term and long term."

January 21, 1963: In an interview with David Kraslow of the Miami Herald Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stated that no U.S. air cover was ever planned or promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in April, 1961.

"There never was any plan to have U.S. air cover," Kennedy said. "There never was any promise. Not even under Mr. Eisenhower was American air cover in the picture."

"From the beginning the President said no American forces would take part in the operation. It was made absolutely clear that under no condition whatsoever, would Americans be used in the invasion."

"And it simply cannot be said that the invasion failed because of any single factor. There were several major mistakes. It was just a bad plan. Victory was never close."

Kennedy confirmed that the invading force appealed to the U.S. warships for help when they were pinned down on the beach. He declined to say whether the appeals were relayed to the President.

"The decision was made that there would be no change in the ground rules," Kennedy said. "There had been a firm understanding always, accepted by everyone, that there would be no U.S. forces in the invasion under any condition. We stayed with that."

Kennedy said no invasion plan had been completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. "There was just a general concept," he said. "The logistics and the details were worked out after the President took office."

"The President has taken responsibility for the failure and that's as it should be. He approved the plan. But it's not true that he sat down with two or three civilians and worked out this plan at the White House."

"The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was war gamed at the Pentagon in whatever manner they do these things."

January 21, 1963: Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, charged that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy appeared to be trying to rewrite history in the "latest example of news management by the New Frontier."

GOLDWATER said he talked with President Kennedy at the latter's request shortly after the invasion fiasco and "I certainly got the impression then that an air cover had been part of the original invasion plans."

Also, he told the Senate, "I am sure the entire American public has understood that the air cover was definitely in the invasion plans until the President was persuaded—by some still unidentified advisers—to cancel it."

GOLDWATER also took issue with a speech last Saturday in which Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON said the "rattlesnake in Cuba" has been defanged.

"I suggest it is a highly optimistic view and one which the United States cannot afford to adopt as a matter of policy," GOLDWATER said. "Castro's Cuba is still a menace to freedom in the Western Hemisphere."

January 21, 1963: Argentine Foreign Minister Carlos Muniz agreed with Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday that the Organization of American States (OAS) should follow up its unified stand in the Cuban crisis with new coordinated moves against Communist Cuba.

Muniz, in a talk with Rusk, is believed to have stressed that Argentina will back solidly any action the United States may take to weaken the Cuban Government and prevent Castroite subversion in Latin America.

January 22, 1963: Senate Republicans moved to conduct their own investigation of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. They said they wanted to get the entire story historically accurate.

Senate GOP Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said he proposed making such a preliminary inquiry on his own and heard no dissent when it was discussed at a GOP policy meeting, yesterday. He said his proposal was not prompted by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona.

DIRKSEN said he plans to make an exploration of his own, take it up with the GOP policy committee staff, and then decide whether the matter should be put up to a Senate legislative committee for more formal investigation.

Senate Democratic Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, suggested that if DIRKSEN wants the entire story he should have his investigation include the circumstances that led to the coming to power in Cuba of Castro and communism.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the DIRKSEN proposal has a very strong partisan aura, and any conclusion would be considered quite partisan.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1337

ones being exploited—not the Latin Americans.

Diplomatic immunity had its day in court—when one of our Federal judges withdrew same from a Cuban United Nations attaché—ordering him to stand trial with two other defendants for conspiracy and failure to register as foreign agents. Since our U.S. Communist Party had also been ordered some time back to register—this seemed only just to many Americans—although Communists of all nations felt it was rank discrimination and entirely unjustified.

Once again Khrushchev effectively stopped any tendency on the part of U.S. citizens toward complacency, by pointing out his principle of coexistence—which had been violently criticized by Red Chinese—had in the past given the Communists time to build strength and was essential for future victories. He again termed ours an “ultimate defeat” because Cuba still remained a Communist nation. About this time all the Communist nations of the Western World jumped on Khrushchev’s bandwagon—calling for unity and a ceasing of “washing their dirty linen” in public. The Red Chinese also declared the Cuban people, with the sympathy and support of peoples of labor in America and the world—had won the victory of Cuba’s independence, her sovereignty, and fruits of her revolution. This of course did not leave our American laboring people with a good taste in their mouth.

Khrushchev indulged in his favorite pastime of “rocket rattling,” declaring that as many as 120 Russian missiles were now ready to be launched at the United States in case of war, and claiming that while 40 rockets had been withdrawn from Cuba, 80 or probably even 120 had been set up in other “better places than Cuba,” although he failed to name the places.

So while the Communists castigated their party members for lack of unity and irresponsible attacks on their policy, our own political parties in this country were suffering the same throes because of disagreement not only as to the proper policy but the degree of information to which the American public was entitled on the Cuban issue. This of course was not an issue in the Communists’ quarrels because their citizens are not guaranteed the privilege of freedom of the press or information.

Senator FULBRIGHT renounced the constitutional right of the Congress to assist in foreign policy decisions by his statement that they—the Congress—interfered with the effectiveness of the President’s leadership thus becoming at one and the same time a most unpopular man with many of his colleagues and a goodly segment of the American public. He pointed out that during the October Cuban crisis the leaders of Congress were informed, but not consulted, and deemed this to be quite proper. However, many felt that he failed by not adding that the President did receive counsel and advice—although not by congressional leaders—but instead by a group called the EX COMM—made up of some National Security Council mem-

bers with a few personal additions of his own.

At long last some of the questions previously raised about Adali Stevenson’s part in deliberations of the Security Council during the Cuban crisis were again brought up, and by one of the same writers who originally had brought this to the attention of the public—Stewart Alsop. However, in this instance he had the guarantee of an approved summary by Clayton Fritchey, Stevenson’s official spokesman at the United Nations.

Robert Kennedy, the Attorney General and President’s brother, committed what some termed his worst faux pas of a series, by allowing himself to be interviewed by the Miami Herald—as well as the U.S. News & World Report—and bringing up the subject once more of the fateful Bay of Pigs invasion. Reiterating that President Kennedy had taken full responsibility for failure of the invasion plans, he stated that the President not only had approved the plan, but it had been fully cleared by the CIA and Joint Chiefs of Staff and air cover had never been promised. Whereupon Senator GOLDWATER contradicted the Attorney General, stating he had been given a definite impression by the President, during a personal interview, that air cover had been a part of the original invasion plans, and charged Bobby Kennedy with not only “rewriting of history” but attempting “news management.”

This resulted in a rash of public statements by various political leaders calling for complete investigations—and as full disclosure of the facts as possible consistent with our national security—to the American public.

Senator FULBRIGHT once again accused the Republicans of “partisanship”—but for his trouble was reminded by several newspaper columnists that he had not been heard calling for a “nonpartisan” approach during either the 1960 presidential campaign—or during President Eisenhower’s administration.

Senator RUSSELL promised an investigation into the military and defense issues but not into the political issues. Senator MORSE recommended a reading of the still-secret transcript of his subcommittee hearings on Latin American affairs before partisan speeches were made but the transcripts were described by Senator GOLDWATER as being “the most inconclusive testimony I have ever read.”

And once again former President Eisenhower was called upon to state whether or not his administration had conceived the ill-fated plan to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs—stated unequivocally that it had not—but rather had contemplated a “guerrilla type of action.” And this seemed to close the chapter as far as the Eisenhower administration’s part in the fiasco was concerned.

But the curiosity of the American public still mounted—and it seemed inevitable to all that something had to be done to clear up the controversy.

On one hand, many public-spirited and sincere citizens indicated they felt perhaps this curiosity was being overdone. A quotation I recently found per-

haps describes their emotions to a certain degree:

Curiosity is a kernel of the forbidden fruit, which still sticketh in the throat of a natural man, sometimes to the danger of his choking.—Fuller.

However, on the other hand, equally public-spirited citizens and equally sincere took the position which might be described by this quotation:

The gratification of curiosity rather frees us from uneasiness, than confers pleasure. We are more pained by ignorance, than delighted by instruction. Curiosity is the thirst of the soul.—Johnson.

But the American public—not bothering with semantics—seemed rather to feel that asking for official reports giving the whole truth—as long as it did not involve giving away valuable national security information to Communist countries—was only a rightful part of their constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press and freedom of speech under a Republican form of Government.

Part 13 of my chronology on Castro and Cuba follows:

PART 13. SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO AND CUBA

January 14, 1963: Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vassily V. Kuznetsov came to Havana last night and gave Fidel Castro fresh assurances that the Kremlin backs the five points raised by the Cuban Prime Minister at the height of the Caribbean crisis.

The points include demands that the United States give up its Guantanamo Naval base, lift trade restrictions imposed against Cuba, and give a no-invasion pledge.

January 15, 1963: Prime Minister Fidel Castro called today for the Communist world to heal its rifts and for revolutionaries of the Western Hemisphere to rise up in violent upheaval against imperialism.

In a fiery televised speech that began last night and lasted several hours, Castro sounded his most aggressive demand yet for revolution in Latin America.

Castro’s speech contained the customary denunciations of President Kennedy and the United States, which he described as “the most aggressive Nation in the world.”

“For us, the Caribbean crisis has not been resolved,” he said. “A war was avoided but the peace was not won.”

“We don’t believe in Kennedy’s words,” he said. “But Kennedy has given no pledge (against invasion) and if he did give it he has already withdrawn it.”

“The imperialists are shipping arms, saboteurs and agents into Cuba, organizing bands of pirates and retaining a piece of our territory (the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo) that points at the heart of our nation.”

Castro also attacked the U.S. sponsored Alliance for Progress as reactionary and antiquated.

“It will not prosper because it is a policy of exploitation,” he said.

January 15, 1963: A Federal judge today denied diplomatic immunity to a Cuban United Nations attaché accused of sabotage conspiracy and threw doubt on immunity for staff members of any foreign U.N. missions and even for ambassadors to the U.N.

In a lengthy and perhaps precedent-setting decision, Judge Edward Weinfeld refused to grant Roberto Santisteban a habeas corpus writ on the basis of diplomatic immunity. He ordered the Cuban to stand trial with two other defendants for conspiracy and failure to register as foreign agents.